

Request for Offers (RFO) Addendum

RFO Number: RFO0112

Addendum Number: 2

Date of Addendum: 3/7/16

Original Due Date, Time: 3/10/2016, 4:00 PM CT

Revised Date, Time (if changing): N/A

Title: eLearning Development and Instructional Design Staff Augmentation

SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

Questions and Answers

Q: Are there incumbent resources currently providing these services?

A: DHS currently has a contractor in a similar role working on a separate project. We have some state staff working on the training initiatives referenced in the RFO, and we are looking for contractor expertise to augment and complement the capacity of the existing team.

Q: Is there a limit to the number of candidates each vendor may propose?

Would you like to review more than one candidate per role from a given vendor?

A: There is no limit to the number of candidates for each role that a vendor can propose if the vendor believes that they have more than one candidate for a given role that would meet the requirements in the RFO. Each vendor remains limited to the submission of one (1) proposal but the proposal may include one or more alternative candidates for each role, subject to the following: All proposed candidates from a given vendor for a given role (i.e., eLearning developer/programmer or instructional designer/writer) must have the same hourly rate to allow for the overall cost proposal to be evaluated against other vendors' cost proposals in a uniform manner. (For example, if a vendor proposes three possible resources for the eLearning developer role and two possible resources for the instructional designer role, the three eLearning developers must have the same proposed hourly rate and the two instructional designers must have the same proposed hourly rate.)

Q: Is it the agencies intention to hire both resources (eLearning and Instructional) from one single vendor or can they be awarded separately?

A: DHS intends to hire both resources from a single vendor.

Q: How do you define training videos? For instance, live-action vs. animation vs. screen simulation? Or are you using the term "training videos" interchangeably with eLearning modules?

A: Training videos may incorporate various formats. There are a number of different applications for training videos including using screen capture / simulation with Adobe Captivate or traditional video production.

Q: When referring to the instructional designer toward the bottom of page 3, the RFO refers to “access” to an instructional designer. We would like to clarify whether the ID would be expected to be integrated into the onsite team similar to the developer. The alternative would be an ID resource who works primarily offsite, coming onsite for occasional face-to-face meetings.

A: Initially, DHS would like to have the instructional designer onsite to get integrated with the team and the projects. As time progresses, more of the work could be done offsite with the ability to bring the resource in for meetings as needed.

Q: In that same paragraph, it says the vendor will be asked to provide input into the strategic training work plan. Is there a specific resource from “vendor side” that you expect would provide this input (e.g. the developer and/or the ID)?

A: Both; this is a collaborative process and input from both roles are valued based the scope of work.

This addendum shall become part of the RFO and should be returned with, or acknowledged in, the response to the RFO.

RESPONDER NAME:

SIGNATURE:

TITLE:

DATE:

Request for Offers (RFO) Addendum

RFO Number: RFO0112

Addendum Number: 1

Date of Addendum: 3/2/16

Original Due Date, Time: 3/10/2016, 4:00 p.m. CT

Revised Date, Time (if changing): N/A

Title: eLearning Development and Instructional Design Staff Augmentation

SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

The following are changes to the RFO: Revising the Process Schedule to extend the time allowed for Questions to be submitted. In this Addendum, changes to pre-existing RFO language will use ~~strike through~~ for deletions and underlining for insertions.

Process Schedule

Deadline for Questions	3/2/2016 <u>3/3/2016</u> , 4:00 p.m. CT
Anticipated Posted Response to Questions	3/7/2016
Proposals due	3/10/2016, 4:00 p.m. CT
Anticipated proposal evaluation begins	3/14/2016
Anticipated proposal evaluation & decision	3/21/2016

This addendum shall become part of the RFO and should be returned with, or acknowledged in, the response to the RFO.

RESPONDER NAME:

SIGNATURE:

TITLE:

DATE: